

FILED

AUG - 3 2005

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Bingham McCutchen LLP
DAVID M. BALABANIAN (SBN 37368)
CHRISTOPHER B. HOCKETT (SBN 121539)
JOY K. FUYUNO (SBN 193890)
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
Telephone: (415) 393-2000
Facsimile: (415) 393-2286

Attorneys for Defendant
Intel Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

LAW OFFICES OF LAUREL STANLEY, a
California business entity, and WILLIAM
CRONIN, a resident of Texas,

Plaintiffs,

v.

INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware
corporation,

Defendant.

No. C-05-2858-MHP

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER TO CONTINUE FILING DATE
FOR DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO
PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT

IT IS STIPULATED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THROUGH THEIR
COUNSEL AS FOLLOWS:

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2, Plaintiffs Law Offices of Laurel Stanley and
William Cronin and Defendant Intel Corporation hereby stipulate that Intel Corporation's
response to Plaintiffs' complaint shall be due either 60 days after transfer of the above captioned
case pursuant to any motion to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C.
Section 1407 or, in the alternative, 45 days after any such motion has been denied. The parties
request this extension of time to answer or otherwise respond because the plaintiffs in *Brauch, et*

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO CONTINUE RESPONSE DATE

1 *al. v. Intel Corp.*, No. C 05-2743 (BZ) (N.D. Cal., filed July 5, 2005), a related matter, have filed
2 a petition to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C. Section 1407, and the
3 above-styled action has been identified as a related action to that petition. As a result the
4 outcome of the pending petition will impact significantly the schedule of this case.

5 This is the first stipulation between the parties. Because this litigation has just
6 begun, granting such a stipulation will not have any negative impact on the schedule of this case.

7 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED.
8 DATED: July ____, 2005

9 Bingham McCutchen LLP

10
11 By: _____
12 JOY K. FUYUNO
13 Attorneys for Defendant
Intel Corporation

14 DATED: July ____, 2005

15 The Furth Firm LLP


16
17
18 By: _____
19 ALEX C. TURAN
20 Attorneys for Plaintiff
21 Law offices of Laurel Stanley,
22 and William Cronin
23
24
25
26

[PROPOSED] ORDER TO CONTINUE DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE DATE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Intel Corporation's response to Plaintiff's complaint shall be due either 60 days after transfer of the above captioned case pursuant to any motion to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings per 28 U.S.C. Section 1407, or, in the alternative, 45 days after any such motion has been denied.

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 8/2, 2005


Honorable Marilyn Hall Patel
United States District Judge